**Guidelines and template for the review of the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework**

## Background

1. The second meeting of the Open-ended Working Group[[1]](#footnote-1) on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework invited the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-fourth meeting to, among other things, carry out a scientific and technical review of the updated goals and targets, and related indicators and baselines, of the draft global biodiversity framework. Under agenda item 3 the Subsidiary Body will consider this issue.
2. Tables 1 and 2, presents a draft monitoring framework for the 2050 Goals and the 2030 targets respectively. These tables are being made available for the purposes of peer review. In both tables’ interim formulations of the proposed 2050 goals and milestones and the 2030 targets are provided for context. Review comments are not being sought on these parts of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework at this time. Column A of the tables provides draft components of the goals and targets. Columns B and C of the tables provide draft monitoring elements and indicators to be used at the global level to monitor progress in the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Further column D provides information on the period baseline data is available for the indicator and on the frequency that the indicator is updated where known. Review comments are being sought on columns A, B, C and D only.

## II. Submitting Comments

1. To ensure that your comments are given due consideration, please send them by e-mail to secretariat@cbd.int, at your earliest convenience but **no later than 25 July 2020**
2. When submitting comments, please adhere to the following guidelines as much as possible:
	1. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word or similar document format using the table provided below.
	2. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
	3. Please avoid commenting on issues related to grammar, spelling, or punctuation, unless it affects the overall meaning of the text, as the document will be edited as the final draft is prepared.
	4. To facilitate the revision process please be as specific as possible in your comments. In areas where you feel additional or alternative text or information is required, please suggest, if possible, what this text may look like or what should be included.
	5. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
	6. Please focus your comments on columns A (monitoring elements), B (indicators) and C (Indicator baseline year and frequency of updates) of the tables 1 and 2.
	7. If you are suggestion the inclusion of additional indicators please provide information on if the indicator is currently operational, the organization supporting its development, its baseline (i.e. the year data is first available) and how frequently the indicator is updated (i.e. monthly, yearly, every two years etc.).
	8. All review comments will be posted on the webpage[[2]](#footnote-2) for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the interests of transparency
3. Should you have any questions regarding the review process, please contact secretariat@cbd.int.

***III. Template for Comments***

1. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
2. The complete draft of the monitoring framework has been released in a portable document format (PDF). For tables 1, 2 and 3 column letters and row numbers have been provided as well as page numbers. Please use these as a reference as illustrated in the table below. General comments can be included in the table by referring to Page 0 and Line 0.

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS**

|  |
| --- |
| **Review comments on the draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework** |
| *Contact information* |
| **Surname:** | Bridgers |
| **Given Name:** | Jessica |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:**  |  |
| **Organization:** | World Animal Net |
| **Address:**  | 25 Chestnut Square |
| **City:** | Boston |
| **Country:** | U.S.A. |
| **E-mail:** | jessica@worldanimal.net |
|  |  | ***Comments*** |
| **Table** | **Page** | **Column letter** | **Row number** | **Comment** |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Multiple monitoring elements (B) are lacking indicators. Monitoring elements need to be defined to ensure they are being correctly evaluated and addressed. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Multiple indicators (C) currently do not have anything for ‘baseline data and frequency of updates.’ If there is no baseline data, because an already-established organization does not collect that data or for any other reason, there should be a proposal how this data plans to be collected. If there is lack of knowledge on the frequency of updates, there should be a proposed timeline for how often this data should be collected and examined.  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Intrinsic value of nature, ecosystems, and biodiversity should always be accounted for. There is a lack of regard for these in and of themselves, and most value that is attributed to them is based on what they contribute to human survival. All wild species contribute to ecosystems, therefore, a more balanced approach is needed. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Many components (A) and monitoring elements (B) include phrases such as ‘sustainable management’ or ‘sustainable practices,’ but they refer to vastly different aspects of biodiversity from marine to terrestrial species. ‘Sustainable’ needs to be defined for each one of these because it will look differently depending on species and/or ecosystem. It is important to remember that humans and animals alike rely on the function of all ecosystems. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Certifications alone, such as MSC or FSC, do not equate to sustainability. Neither do established limits/quotas, so a comprehensive view of biodiversity needs to be considered. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The One Health framework, and the more comprehensive concept [One Welfare](https://www.onewelfareworld.org/), should be integrated throughout to emphasize the interconnectivity between planet, human, and animal welfare.  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Sustainable management, for forests and marine resources alike, should be the last resort. Priority should be given to protecting and conserving biodiversity rather than use. There are also different levels of protection, so the highest level of protection will lead to the most benefits. It is important not to focus on the commodification of biodiversity because this can lead to negative effects such as overexploitation of wild species. |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | There is a lot of emphasis on the benefits of biodiversity for humans, but there are also many risks related to the use of biodiversity that have not been addressed (such as zoonotic diseases).  |
| 1 | 3 | A | 34 | When referring to ‘health of species,’ as written in A4, health must be defined. Animal health includes mental and physical well-being of individuals, defined by the access to food, decreased or absence of threats from human-wildlife conflict, etc. Animal health also includes population well-being, defined by ecosystem health, geographic range, etc.  |
| 1 | 4 | A | 42 | The definition of ‘critical ecosystems’ is required. This definition can change depending on what criteria is used. It is important not to define this solely based on human need. Intrinsic value of nature, and the value of ecosystems to other species, must also be considered. |
| 1 | 4 | B | 46-48 | The phrase ‘of particular importance’ may, as the previous comment pointed out, change depending on how an area is defined as particularly important. It is important to remember that all ecosystems and biodiversity have a role, therefore, they are all necessary to ensure a fully functioning planet. The precautionary principle is also urged.  |
| 1 | 5 | B | 51 | Add restoration: ‘Trends in habitat creation, *restoration*, and maintenance’ |
| 1 | 5 | C | 51 | Forests under sustainable management should not be the priority. Sustainable management should be implemented when necessary, but the priority should be restoring and maintaining forests with minimal, or no, use. This would apply more to the goal component: ‘regulating contributions to climate change.’ |
| 1 | 5 | B | 60 | Add coastal habitats: ‘Trends in regulation of coastal water quality *and habitats’* to emphasize the need for fully functioning coastal ecosystems in prevention methods [against natural disasters](https://wwf.panda.org/?291130/World-Wetlands-Day-Mangrove-Ecotourism-Protects-Vulnerable-Vietnam-Delta). |
| 1 | 6 | B | 63 | What and who defines ‘detrimental organisms and biological processes’? And how will these be regulated? |
| 1 | 6 | A | 64 | Measuring biodiversity based on ‘material contributions,’ and using the indicators provided that emphasize ecosystem services rather than the value in protecting biodiversity, will likely lead to adverse, if unintentional, consequences. Advocating for the use of biodiversity may continue the current trend in biodiversity loss. |
| 1 | 6 | A | 68 | [Mental health](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/11745398.2019.1655459) is another indicator of nature’s ‘non-material contributions.’ |
| 1 | 6 | A | 77 | The ‘Availability of sufficient financial resources’ (D1) and its indicators must also consider the financial resources invested in practices harmful to reaching targets and goals and to biodiversity. Even if more financial resources are utilized for protecting biodiversity, the continued investment into practices that go against biodiversity can negate this trend.We also suggest considering adding a component on elimination of financial flows detrimental to biodiversity (i.e. subsidies for intensive agricultural development which contribute to land use change).  |
| 1 | 7 | A | 81 | Capacity building must define the need to empower women and girls, local and/or marginalized communities, and indigenous peoples.  |
| 2 | 8 | A | 6 | Rather than only the ‘Prevention of reduction and fragmentation of natural habitats due to land/sea use change,’ also the active restoration and conservation of previously fragmented habitats.  |
| 2 | 9 | B | 21 | Agriculture lands and forest should be separated here. Although the indicators are separated, these two areas are different and, therefore, should not be combined. |
| 2 | 10 | B | 35 | ‘Protected areas’ needs to be defined. There are different levels of protection, so the coverage of all protected areas does not accurately demonstrate ongoing trends. |
| 2 | 12 | B | 55 | Along with ‘Trends in human-wildlife conflicts,’ the management of these conflicts must be considered. Some management programs advocate the removal or killing of animals (often predators) to minimize conflict, but this goes against protection of biodiversity. This should then measure trends in human-wildlife conflicts within a framework that protects and encourages biodiversity in culturally appropriate contexts. |
| 2 | 12-13 | B | 56 | The target component, ‘Harvest is legal, sustainable and safe for human health and biodiversity,’ needs to define safe. Safe only for humans (if so, must consider zoonotic diseases), or safe methods that do not cause damage to ecosystems? Further, the existence of “legal” as a target component is strange. For example, this could be met simply by legalizing all trade in wildlife. Instead, legality of trade should be contingent on real and measurable factors and only seen as legitimate if it is determined by a conservation and ethical framework.  |
| 2 | 12-13 | A | 56-65 | Legal harvest does not equate to sustainable harvest.  |
| 2 | 12-13 | C | 56 & 61 | ‘Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked’ is mentioned twice, but legality is not the only concern regarding the wildlife trade. The commercial wildlife trade must also be accounted for, and trends for this should be evaluated. The legal trade of wildlife includes trophy hunting, the pet and luxury goods trades and other practices that harm individual animals as well as wild populations. |
| 2 | 13 | B | 58 & 65 | ‘Trends in proportion of biological resources used within the established limits’ is mentioned twice. Remaining in limits is difficult to do when data is not updated, and the act of staying within limits does not equate to a sustainable practice. |
| 2 | 14-15 | A | 67-80 | Any wildlife management practices, including invasive species, must account for animal sentience and individual well-being, as animal welfare science and the study of animal cognition and sentience are scientific fields which should not be treated in separate silos. An ethical framework is needed which balances harm, to humans, nature, biodiversity and animals. [Compassionate conservation](https://www.uts.edu.au/research-and-teaching/our-research/centre-compassionate-conservation/about-us/what-compassionate-conservation) is a framework many scientists have adopted to address this issue. |
| 2 | 16 | A | 89-90 | Plastic pollution is being evaluated in water bodies, but this also affects land, land quality, and terrestrial mammals. These need to have indicators, also. |
| 2 | 17 | C | 104 | There needs to be a distinction between small fisheries and industrial fisheries. Small fisheries part of local communities should be evaluated differently than fisheries with fleets. Industrial fisheries need to be managed and regulated more carefully since they can deplete fish populations quicker and more efficiently. |
| 2 | 17-18 | C | 105-109 | There is no mention of the methods of fishing that are damaging to fish populations such as bottom trawling, dynamite fishing, longlining, etc. These are harmful for oceans and marine species and need to be prevented. |
| 2 | 19 | B | 114 | Only focusing on ‘Trends in terrestrial wild species of fauna used for food and medicine’ negates the intrinsic value of animals and species. Even the sustainable management of these poses risks to biodiversity and does not account for the many other functions wild species have as part of the ecosystem.  |
| 2 | 20 | C | 118-119 | ‘Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture’ and ‘Areas of agricultural land under conservation agriculture’ should consider regenerative agriculture and agro-ecological solutions. |
| 2 | 22 | B | 133-139 | Human benefits cannot be the only thing emphasized when discussing biodiversity. Risks, as well, such as zoonotic diseases need to be considered. Also, the benefits of fully functioning ecosystems. |
| 2 | 24-25 | C | 150 | Add indigenous knowledge: ‘traditional and indigenous knowledge’  |
| 2 | 29 | B | 175 | Circular economy needs emphasis and needs indicators.  |
| 2 | 29 | B | 176 | ‘Trends in waste management’ should have an indicator for domestic animal waste. |
| 2 | 31 & 37 | C | 192 & 233 | Zoo and aquarium visitors are not representative of public knowledge of biodiversity and knowledge outside of these institutions should be noted.  |
| 2 | 36 | A | 222 | Capacity building should have different indicators for different communities i.e. indigenous, women and girls, etc. |
| 2 | 38 | A | 236 | Traditional knowledge should only be shared based on standards of sustainability and accessibility.  |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* *secretariat@cbd.int****no later than 15 August 2020****.*
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